

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-19, which were all of the then pending claims, over the prior art, primarily a document printed from a Web site and titled "Way Back Machine" (Collins). Specifically, Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by Collins, and Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Official Notice.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are being amended to keep the language of these claims consistent with the language of Claims 1, 7 and 13 respectively. New Claim 20, which depends from Claim 1, is being added to describe preferred or optional features of the present invention.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1-20 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and the rejections of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and 112, and to allow Claims 1-20.

Generally, Claims 1-20 patentably distinguish over the prior art because the prior art does not disclose or suggest providing a user with interactive access to a manufactures and to a database over the Internet, which in turn provides a comprehensive and total, Web based solution to providing after sales service data, as described in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13. In order to best understand this difference between the present invention and the prior art, and to understand the significance of this difference, it may be helpful to review briefly the instant invention and the prior art.

The present invention, generally, relates to methods and systems for providing after sales service data. As explained in detail in the present application, this invention may be effectively

used to provide a complete solution that addresses all of the needs of the service after sales. To achieve this comprehensive solution, a stream of information flows to and from a database, between a service provider and an equipment manufacturer, integrating back office and front office operations, and allowing total management over customer service.

By utilizing this back-and-forth, interactive approach, the instant invention achieves a number of important advantages. For instance, the invention helps the manufacturer increase service revenue, to capture better customer and equipment history, to improve turn around time, to increase profitability, management of spare parts, warranty administration and customer satisfaction. In addition, the invention allows the service provider to obtain information such as service history, and account and billing information.

The procedure disclosed in Collins does not achieve the same comprehensiveness that is achieved with the present invention. In particular, the Collins document is a Web page from a Wet site. This Web site provides some information about servicing products, but it does not provide the same interactive access, via the Internet, with both the manufacturer and the manufacturer's database that the present invention does provide.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 are herein being amended to describe more explicitly the above-discussed feature of the instant invention. Specifically, each of these claims is being amended to indicate expressly that the user is provided with interactive access over the Internet both to the manufacturer and to the database that contains the complete set of after sales service data.

This interactive access is important for a number of reasons. One important reason is that it gives a service provider a comprehensive and complete, Web based solution that addresses all of the needs of the service after sales. Moreover, the present invention may be used, as

explained in detail in the present application, to give a service provider with enterprise wide visibility to a continuous stream of data and information.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether they are considered individually or in combination, are not believed to be any more relevant than Collins. In particular, these other references, again whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed Internet based, interactive access provided by the present invention.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7 and 13 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, Claims 1, 7 and 13 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-6, 19 and 20 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. In addition, Claims 8-12 are dependent from Claim 7 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 14-18 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 13.

In light of the above-discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and the rejections of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and 112, and to allow Claims 1-20. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
JSS:jy